arXiv:1403.7898v1 [astro-ph.HE] 31 Mar 2014

2014.3 v1

On the puzzling spindown behavior of magnetar SGR J1745−2900

H. Tong[1]

ABSTRACT

SGR J1745−2900 is a magnetar near the Galactic center. X-ray observations found a decreasing X-ray luminosity accompanied by an enhanced spindown rate. A toy model is constructed employing the change of polar cap angle to explain this negative correlation. During the release of magnetic energy of magnetars, a system of particles may be generated. Some of these particles remain trapped in the magnetosphere and may contribute to the X-ray luminosity. The rest of the particles can flow out and take away the rotational energy. A smaller polar cap angle will cause the X-ray luminosity decrease and enhanced spindown rate of SGR J1745−2900. This magnetar is expected to have a maximum spindown rate shortly.

Subject headings: pulsars individual: (SGR J1745−2900; Swift J1822.3−1606) — stars: magnetar — stars: neutron — stars: winds

1. Introduction

Magnetars are a special kind of pulsars. They are assumed to neutron stars whose activities are powered by their magnetic energy (Duncan & Thompson 1992). Like ordinary pulsars, the period and period derivative of magnetars can also be measured (Kouveliotou et al. 1998). However, unlike ordinary pulars, both the radiative and timing properties of magnetars vary with time. During the outburst of a magnetar, the star's X-ray luminosity increase significantly and followed by a gradual decay (Rea & Esposito 2011). At the same time, there may be short burst, changes of pulse profile and X-ray spectra etc. The outburst may also accompanied by timing events, e.g., spin-up glitch (Kaspi et al. 2003), or spin-down glitch (Archibald et al. 2013; Tong 2014), and/or period derivative changes.

[1]Xinjiang Astronomical Observatory, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Urumqi, Xinjiang 830011, China *tonghao@xao.ac.cn*

Many magnetars show different degrees of period derivative variations, e.g., XTE J1810−197 (Camilo et al. 2007), 1E 1547.0−5408 (Camilo et al. 2008), PSR J1622−4950 (Levin et al. 2012), 1E 1048.1−5937 (Dib & Kaspi 2014), SGR 1806−20 (Woods et al. 2007). The timing variabilities imply that the magnetic dipole braking in vacuum is a poor approximation in the case of magnetars and magnears may be wind baking (Tong et al. 2013).

The timing and flux evolution of the Galactic center magnetar SGR J1745−2900 showed a negative correlation between X-ray luminosity and spindown rate (Kaspi et al. 2014). During the nearly four months observations, the magnetars's X-ray luminosity decreased by a factor of two. While, the spindown rate has increased by a factor of 2.6. And the spindown rate is still increasing. This negative correlation is hard to explain (Kaspi et al. 2014). Kaspi et al. (2014) discussed changes in the open field line regions. However, there is no quantitative calculation at present.

In the wind braking model of magnetars (Tong et al. 2013), a particle outflow is generated during the decay of the magnetic field. Some of these particles may remain confined in the magnetosphere and contribute to the X-ray luminosity. The rest of the particles can flow out to infinity (i.e., wind), thus dominate the spindown of the magnetars. Since both the X-ray luminosity and the particle wind originate from magnetic field decay, it is natural that there are correlations between radiative and timing properties of magnetars (Tong & Xu 2014). During the outburst, if the particle wind decays in a similar way as that of the X-ray luminosity, a decreasing X-ray luminosity and deceasing spindown rate is expected (as has been observed in many magnetars, e.g., Woods et al. 2007). This may solve the timing ambiguities of Swift J1822.3−1606 (Tong & Xu 2013; Scholz et al. 2014). Meanwhile, the particle outflow may be mainly confined in a specific polar cap angle of the star. If the total particle luminosity does no vary significant, the change in polar cap angle will dominate the radiative and timing behavior of the magnetar. If the polar cap angle is smaller, this will result in a smaller X-ray luminosity and larger spindown rate. This may explain the puzzling spindown behavior of SGR J1745−2900.

Calculations in the wind braking model for SGR J1745−2900 are given in Section 2. Discussions and conclusions are presented in Section 3.

2. Wind braking model for the spindown behavior of SGR J1745−2900

2.1. Qualitative descriptions

Figure 1 shows the magnetar magnetosphere in the case of wind braking. The decay of the star's magnetic energy may result in a bunch of particles, with total particle luminosity

$L_{\rm p}$. The particle luminosity may be similar to the magnetar's X-ray luminosity[1] ($L_{\rm p} \sim L_{\rm x} \sim 10^{35}\,{\rm erg\,s^{-1}}$, Duncan 2000). There exist a maximum length $r_{\rm max}$ for the coupling between the neutron star and its magnetosphere. The corresponding polar cap angle is θ_s. From quasi-periodic oscillation observations in magnetars, $\theta_{\rm s}$ is about 0.05 (Timokhin et al. 2008; Watts 2011; Tong et al. 2013). All particles will try to flow out in this polar cap area. Considering the presence of large scale dipole field, some of these particle will be trapped. The opening radius $r_{\rm open}$ characterize this quantitatively. It is defined as the radius where the particle kinetic energy density equals the local magnetic energy density (Harding et al. 1999; Thompson et al. 2000; Tong et al. 2013). Assuming uniform distribution of particles across the polar cap, $r_{\rm open}$ is (Equation (20) in Tong et al. 2013)

$$r_{\rm open} = 7 \times 10^9\, b_0^{2/3} L_{\rm p,35}^{-1/3} (\theta_{\rm s}/0.05)^{2/3}\,{\rm cm}, \tag{1}$$

where b_0 is surface dipole field (at the magnetic pole) in units of the quantum critical field ($4.4 \times 10^{13}\,{\rm G}$), $L_{\rm p,35}$ is the total particle luminosity in units of $10^{35}\,{\rm erg\,s^{-1}}$. The polar cap angle of the magnetic field line whose maximum radius equals $r_{\rm open}$ is $\theta_{\rm open} = (r_0/r_{\rm open})^{1/2}$ (where r_0 is the neutron star radius, it is taken as $10^6\,{\rm cm}$ during numerical calculations).

For particles in the polar cap region with $\theta < \theta_{\rm open}$ (dubbed as the "wind region"), they can flow out to infinity and carry away the star's rotational energy. This particle component dominates the spindown behavior of the central star. It is denoted as $L_{\rm w}$ (the wind luminosity). While, for particles in the polar cap region with $\theta_{\rm open} < \theta < \theta_{\rm s}$, they will be trapped by the dipole field. The magnetic field lines with polar cap angle between $\theta_{\rm open}$ and $\theta_{\rm s}$ make up a special region (dubbed as the "trap region"). Here the particle will remain trapped and may finally contribute to the X-ray luminosity of the magnetar. If near one foot of the field lines, there is a domain with higher magnetic field strength than the surrounding area ("magnetic spot", in analogy with the sun spot), a hot spot may be formed. Observationally, the emission radius of the blackbody component of SGR J1745−2900 is about 2 km (Kaspi et al. 2014). Then the length scale of the magnetic spot should also be about 2 km. The pulse profile of SGR J1745−2900 has multipeaks (Kaspi et al. 2014). This may due to the presence of multipole field (e.g., a magnetic spot).

The total particle luminosity is equal to the sum of wind luminosity and X-ray luminosity[2]: $L_{\rm p} = L_{\rm w} + L_{\rm x}$. Observationally, some magnetars can have a nearly constant X-ray

[1]The particle energy can be converted to either soft X-ray or hard X-ray luminosity. For SGR J1745−2900, its soft X-ray luminosity dominates the electromagnetic energy output (Kaspi et al. 2014).

[2]There may be other sources of X-ray luminosity, e.g., internal heating (Vigano et al. 2013). As long as the contribution from outflowing particles is comparable to those sources (e.g., they contribute equally), the description in this section is still valid. See Section 3 for further discussions.

luminosity early during the outburst (lasts for about 100 days, Rea & Esposito 2011). Then it is also possible that the total particle luminosity can maintain nearly constant for about 100 days. For a constant particle luminosity $L_{\rm p}$, if the polar cap radius $\theta_{\rm s}$ changes, this will cause a variation of X-ray luminosity and wind luminosity (i.e., spindown rate). And they will be negatively correlated with each other. The change in polar cap radius is accompanied/triggered by short burst. For SGR J1745−2900, it has a short burst on MJD 56450 (Kennea et al. 2013; Kaspi et al. 2014). After the short burst, some local multipole field may annihilate (which may correspond to the disappearance of one pulse profile peak, Kaspi et al. 2014). The coupling length scale between the neutron star and the magnetosphere $r_{\rm max}$ will increase. The polar cap angle $\theta_{\rm s}$ will decrease. For a constant particle luminosity, a decrease of polar cap angle will result in a decrease of particles in the trap region (i.e., lower X-ray luminosity) and an increase of particles in the wind region (i.e., a higher wind luminosity and consequently enhanced spindown rate). This may correspond to the decreasing X-ray luminosity and enhanced spindown rate of SGR J1745−2900 (Kaspi et al. 2014). Furthermore, the space density of the particles may increase (due to a smaller polar cap area). This will result in a harder spectrum (Kaspi et al. 2014). All these aspects are qualitatively in agreement with the observations of SGR J1745−2900, especially the decreasing X-ray luminosity and the enhanced spindown rate.



Fig. 1.— The magnetosphere in the presence of a particle wind, for illustrative use only.

2.2. Calculations

According to wind braking model of magnetars (Tong et al. 2013, especially Section 3.3 there), the relation between the star's surface dipole field, its timing measurement and the wind properties (mainly $L_{\rm p}$ and $\theta_{\rm s}$) is (Equation (24) in Tong et al. 2013):

$$B_0 = 3.3\times10^{32}\left(\frac{\dot{P}}{P}\right)^{3/2} L_{\rm p,35}^{-1}(\theta_{\rm s}/0.05)^2\,{\rm G}, \tag{2}$$

where B_0 is the surface dipole field, P and $\dot{P}$ are the star's rotation period and period derivative, respectively. For a short duration (e.g., 100 days), the star's surface dipole field and rotation period change very little. Assuming a constant total particle luminosity, then the period derivative is proportional to

$$\dot{P}\propto(\theta_{\rm s}/0.05)^{-4/3}. \tag{3}$$

Observationally, the spindown rate of SGR J1745−2900 increased by a factor of 2.6 (Kaspi et al. 2014). This requires that the polar cap angle is about 0.5 times the initial value: $\theta_{\rm s,f} = 0.5\theta_{\rm s,i}$ (where $\theta_{\rm s,i}$ and $\theta_{\rm s,f}$ are the initial and final polar cap angle during the observations, respectively). The wind luminosity is related with the total particle luminosity as

$$L_{\rm w} = L_{\rm p}\frac{\theta_{\rm open}^2}{\theta_{\rm s}^2}, \tag{4}$$

since they are proportional to the corresponding polar cap area. The X-ray luminosity is

$$L_{\rm x} = L_{\rm p} - L_{\rm w} = L_{\rm p}\left(1-\frac{\theta_{\rm open}^2}{\theta_{\rm s}^2}\right). \tag{5}$$

The X-ray luminosity of SGR J1745−2900 decreased by a factor of 2 during the observations (Kaspi et al. 2014). This requires that

$$\frac{L_{\rm x,f}}{L_{\rm x,i}} = \frac{1-(\theta_{\rm open}^2/\theta_{\rm s}^2)_{\rm f}}{1-(\theta_{\rm open}^2/\theta_{\rm s}^2)_{\rm i}} = 0.5, \tag{6}$$

where $L_{\rm x,i}$ and $L_{\rm x,f}$ are the initial and final X-ray luminosities, respectively. From Equation (1), $\theta_{\rm open}^2 \propto 1/r_{\rm open} \propto \theta_{\rm s}^{-2/3}$. Then $\theta_{\rm open}^2/\theta_{\rm s}^2 \propto \theta_{\rm s}^{-8/3}$. Using the above timing results, Equation (6) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1-2.6^2\,(\theta_{\rm open}^2/\theta_{\rm s}^2)_{\rm i}}{1-(\theta_{\rm open}^2/\theta_{\rm s}^2)_{\rm i}} = 0.5. \tag{7}$$

Therefore, the two polar cap angles are related with each other as

$$(\theta^2_{\rm open}/\theta^2_{\rm s})_{\rm i} = 0.08, \tag{8}$$

where a subscript i means the initial value. From Equation (5) and using flux observations of SGR J1745−2900 (Kaspi et al. 2014), the total particle luminosity in the wind braking model is: $L_{\rm p} = 1.7 \times 10^{35}\,{\rm erg\,s^{-1}}$ (assuming a flux of $2 \times 10^{-11}\,{\rm erg\,s^{-1}\,cm^{-2}}$ and a distance of 8 kpc). Solving Equation (2) and (8) together, the surface dipole field and initial polar cap angle can be obtained: $B_0 = 1.8 \times 10^{14}\,{\rm G}$ and $\theta_{\rm s,i} = 0.033$. B_0 is slightly lower than the surface dipole field when assuming magnetic dipole braking in vacuum (at the magnetic pole, which is $3.1 \times 10^{14}\,{\rm G}$). This is because the particle wind will also contribute to the rotational energy loss rate and a lower surface dipole field is required. $\theta_{\rm s,i}$ is similar to the estimated value using quasi-periodic oscillation observations (which is about 0.05). It is much larger than the polar cap angle in the absence of a particle wind (which is about 0.007). This is because a strong particle wind will comb out magnetic field lines and result in a much larger polar cap angle (Harding et al. 1999; Tong et al. 2013). This is the first time that the polar cap angle of magnetar wind can be determined.

Therefore, in the wind braking model, SGR J1745−2900 is a magnetar with surface dipole field $B_0 = 1.8 \times 10^{14}\,{\rm G}$ and total particle luminosity $L_{\rm p} = 1.7 \times 10^{35}\,{\rm erg\,s^{-1}}$. Its initial polar cap angle is $\theta_{\rm s,i} = 0.033$. During the observation, its polar cap angle changes to 0.5 times the initial value. This causes the decrease of X-ray luminosity and enhanced spindown rate (Kaspi et al. 2014). In the above calculations, a constant particle luminosity is assumed. In the real case, the particle luminosity may also decrease slightly during the observations. The corresponding X-ray luminosity should decrease smoothly (Kaspi et al. 2014).

3. Discussions and conclusions

For radio pulsars, the timing behavior of intermittent pulsars demonstrates the existence of a particle wind (Kramer et al. 2006). The spindown ratio of intermittent pulsars is determined by the particle wind luminosity and the magnetic inclination angle (Li et al. 2013). In the wind braking model of magnetars, the total particle luminosity and the polar cap angle determine the spindown behavior of the magnetar (Tong et al. 2013). For magnetar Swift J1822.3−1606, different timing observations found a different spindown rate (Rea et al. 2012; Scholz et al. 2012). This timing ambiguity may be solved if the period derivative is decreasing with time (due to a decreasing particle luminosity, Tong & Xu 2013). Wind braking model predicted a long term averaged period derivative $\dot{P} = 1.9 \times 10^{-14}$ (Tong & Xu 2013, Section 2, last paragraph). Recent timing of this source found a period derivative $\dot{P} = (2.1 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-14}$ (Scholz et al. 2014). It is consistent with the wind braking model.

Assuming the observed X-ray luminosity is solely due to other sources, it is unavoidable that a particle wind is generated during the decay of the magnetic field (Thompson & Duncan 1996; Beloborodov & Thompson 2007). This particle wind will have a comparable luminosity to that of the X-ray emissions $L_{\rm p} \sim L_{\rm x} \sim 10^{35}\,{\rm erg\,s^{-1}}$ (Thompson & Duncan 1996; Duncan 2000). Using Equation (2), the corresponding surface dipole field is $B_0 \approx 6.8 \times 10^{14}\,(\theta_{\rm s}/0.05)^2\,{\rm G}$. It is similar to the surface dipole field in the case of magnetic dipole braking. Only a small fraction of the particles flows out to infinity. Most of them remain trapped in the magnetosphere. They will collide with the stellar surface, scattering off X-ray photons etc (Thompson et al. 2002; Beloborodov & Thompson 2007). Another X-ray component is generated which is comparable to the original X-ray component. Therefore, the outflowing particles must contribute a significant fraction to the X-ray luminosity. Previous studies favor a magnetospheric origin for the X-ray luminosity during the outburst (Beloborodov 2011). The upper limit of quiescent X-ray luminosity may put strong constraint on the contribution from other persistent energy sources (Mori et al. 2013). In summary, the assumption is reasonable that the X-ray luminosity (at least half of it) may be dominated by the contribution of outflowing particles.

According to the numerical calculations, the total particle luminosity of SGR J1745−2900 is $L_{\rm p} = 1.7 \times 10^{35}\,{\rm erg\,s^{-1}}$. If all these particles can flow out, this corresponds to the maximum spindown case $L_{\rm w} = L_{\rm p}$ (Tong et al. 2013, Section 3.2). Therefore, SGR J1745−2900 has a maximum spindown rate. Using Equation (31) in Tong et al. (2013), the maximum period derivative is $\dot{P}_{\rm max} = 2.2 \times 10^{-11}$. It is about two times higher than the period derivative in the second ephemeris of SGR J1745−2900 (Kaspi et al. 2014). Using the period second derivative measurement (Kaspi et al. 2014), the time required to reach this maximum spindown state is $(\dot{P}_{\rm max} - \dot{P})/\ddot{P} \approx 240\,{\rm days}$. Therefore, after less than one year, SGR J1745−2900 may reach a state with maximum spindown rate. If the particle luminosity decreases a little at that time, the correspond period derivative will also be a little smaller. The X-ray luminosity during the maximum spindown state will be very small since a very small fraction of particles is trapped. Other sources of X-ray luminosity may only contribute a relatively small part of the X-ray luminosity (Mori et al. 2013). From previous experiences of magnetar outburst (Rea & Esposito 2011), both the X-ray luminosity and spindown rate will decrease long after the outburst.

The timing behavior of Swift J1822.3−1606 is governed by the change of wind luminosity (Tong & Xu 2013). On the other hand, the timing behavior of SGR J1745−2900 may be dominated by the change of polar cap angle. In general, both the particle luminosity and the polar cap angle vary with time after the outburst. This may explain the different radiative and timing correlations in magnetars (Dib & Kaspi 2014 and references therein). Combined with timing studies of pulsars (Li et al. 2013 and references therein), not only magnetars

but also normal pulsars are wind braking. The differences between them are (Tong et al. 2013 and references therein): magnetic dipole braking is correct to the lowest-order approximation for normal pulsars (e.g., when calculating the surface dipole field). While for magnetars, magnetic dipole braking is incorrect even to the lowest order approximation and the formalism of wind braking must be employed. The reason is that: the particle luminosity is at most equal to the rotational energy loss rate for normal pulsars. On the other hand, magnetar's particle luminosity can be powered by the magnetic energy and much higher than the rotational energy loss rate.

One consequence of the wind braking model of magnetars is a magnetism-powered pulsar wind nebula (Tong et al. 2013). There is one weak evidence (Younes et al. 2012). From the pulsar wind nebulae observations in normal pulsars, the nebula luminosity is only about 10^{-4} times the total particle luminosity[3] (Kargaltsev & Pavlov 2010). For SGR J1745−2900, its particle luminosity is about $10^{35}\,\mathrm{erg\,s^{-1}}$. At a distance of 8 kpc, with an X-ray efficiency of about 10^{-4}, it is unlikely that the nebula can be observed using current telescopes (Kargaltsev & Pavlov 2010). Furthermore, the particle wind in the case of magnetars may only exist for several years (the same duration as the outburst). And its luminosity also decreases with time. This will make its detection more difficult. Current non-detections of wind nebula are not constraining (e.g., Archibald et al. 2013).

In conclusion, in the wind braking model of magnetars, change of polar cap angle may cause a negative correlation between the X-ray luminosity and the spindown rate. A polar cap angle 0.5 times the initial value will explain the decrease of X-ray luminosity (by a factor of two) and enhancement of spindown rate (by a factor of 2.6) of SGR J1745−2900. SGR J1745−2900 is expected to reach a state with maximum spindown rate shortly.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank C.Wang, J.L.Han and R.X.Xu for discussions. H.Tong is supported by NSFC (11103021), West Light Foundation of CAS (LHXZ201201), Xinjiang Bairen project, and Qing Cu Hui of CAS.

REFERENCES

Archibald, R. F., Kaspi, V. M., Ng, C. Y., et al. 2013, Nature, 497, 591

[3]The particle luminosity is equal to the rotational energy loss rate in the case of normal pulsars.

Beloborodov, A. M., & Thompson, C. 2007, ApJ, 657, 967

Beloborodov, A. M. 2009, ApJ, 703, 1044

Beloborodov, A. M. 2011, in N. Rea and D.F. Torres (eds.), High-Energy Emission from Pulsars and their Systems, 299 (arXiv:1008.4388)

Camilo, F., Cognard, I., Ranson, S. M., et al. 2007, ApJ, 663, 497

Camilo, F., Reynolds, J., Johnson, S., et al. 2008, ApJ, 679, 681

Dib, R., & Kaspi, V. M. 2014, ApJ, 784, 37

Duncan, R. C., & Thompson, C. 1992, ApJ, 392, L9

Duncan, R. C. 2000, AIP conference proceedings, 526, 830

Harding , A. K., Contopoulos, I., & Kazanas, D. 1999, ApJ, 525, L125

Kargaltsev, O., & Pavlov, G. G. 2010, arXiv:1002.0885

Kaspi, V. M., Gavriil, F. P., & Woods, P. M. 2003, ApJ, 588, L93

Kaspi, V. M., Archibald, R. F., Bhalerao, V., et al. 2014, arXiv:1403.5344

Kennea, J. A., Burrows, D. N., Cummings, J., et al. 2013, The Astronomers Telegram, 5124, 1

Kouveliotou, C., Dieters, S., Strohmayer, T., et al. 1998, Nature, 393, 235

Kramer, M., Lyne, A. G., O'brien, et al. 2006, Science, 312, 549

Levin, L., Bailes, M., Bates, S. D., et al. 2012, MNRAS, 442, 2489

Li, L., Tong, H., Yan, W. M., et al. 2013, arXiv:1312.1016

Mori, K., Gotthelf, E. V., Zhang, S., et al. 2013, ApJ, 770, L23

Rea, N., & Esposito, P. 2011, arXiv:1101.4472

Rea, N., Israel, G. L., Esposito, P., et al. 2012, ApJ, 754, 27

Scholz, P., Ng, C. Y., Livingstone, M. A., et al. 2012, ApJ, 761, 66

Scholz P., Kaspi, V. M., & Cumming, A. 2014, arXiv:1401.6965

Thompson, C., & Duncan, R. C. 1996, ApJ, 473, 322

Thompson, C., Duncan, R. C., Woods, P. M., et al. 2000, ApJ, 543, 340

Thompson, C., Lyutikov, M., & Kulkarni, S. R. 2002, ApJ, 574, 332

Timokhin, A. N., Eichler, D., & Lyubarsky, Yu. 2008, ApJ, 680, 1398

Tong, H., & Xu, R. X. 2013, RAA, 13, 1207

Tong, H., Xu, R. X., Song, L. M., & Qiao, G. J. 2013, ApJ, 768, 144

Tong, H. 2014, ApJ, 784, 86

Tong, H., & Xu, R. X. 2014, arXiv:1401.0283

Vigano, D., Rea, N., Pons, J. A., et al. 2013, MNRAS, 434, 123

Watts, A. L. 2011, arXiv:1111.0514

Woods, P. M., Kouveliotou, C., Finger, M. H., et al. 2007, ApJ, 654, 470

Younes, G., Kouveliotou, C., Kargaltsev, O., et al. 2012, ApJ, 757, 39

This preprint was prepared with the AAS LaTeX macros v5.2.